DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 308 903 JC 890 338

AUTHOR Hudson, Rochelle; And Others
TITLE Project for Adult College Education (PACE) Evaluation.
INSTITUTION Los Angeles Community Coll. District, Calif.
PUB DATE Mar 89
NOTE 40p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adult Education; Adult Students; Community Colleges; Nontraditional Education; Nontraditional Students; *Outcomes of Education; *Outreach Programs; *Participant Satisfaction; Program Evaluation; School Holding Power; Student Attitudes; *Student Attrition; Student Characteristics; Teacher Attitudes; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

The Project for Adult College Education (PACE) is a unique educational delivery system designed to meet the needs of working adults through television courses, conferences, seminars, theme-focused interdisciplinary courses, and team teaching. In March 1989, an evaluation of PACE was conducted in the Los Angeles Community College District, focusing on student characteristics, indicators of program quality, student outcomes, and faculty and student views of the program. Study findings included the following: (1) 91% of the PACE students intended to transfer to a four-year institution; (2) 88% were employed full time, and 27% were affiliated with a union; (3) course requirements in PACE classes included an average of 4.9 written and/or performance assignments, in addition to regular reading assignments; (4) semester-to-semester retention was higher in PACE than in regular classes; (5) within-semester retention in PACE was 74%; (6) in spring 1987, black students accounted for 27.4% of the PACE enrollment and 18.4% of the total enrollment; (7) PACE was found to exceed the program completion rate of regular programs by 20%; (8) PACE's program schedule and off-campus locations were major attractions for students; (9) 53.8% of the PACE students rated the quality of instruction as excellent; and (10) 92% of the PACE faculty gave the program a rating of good or excellent. Recommendations for improving the PACE program are included. (JMC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED308903

PROJECT FOR ADULT COLLEGE EDUCATION (PACE)

EVALUATION

PACE Evaluation Steering Committee

Rochelle Hudson, Chair

Los Angeles Community College District

March, 1989

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Hudson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

JC 890 338

LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

1988-89 BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Harold A. Garvin, President
Lindsay Conner, Vice President
Wallace Albertson
Arthur Bronson
Dr. David Lopez-Lee
Julia L. Wu
Enrique Hernandez, Student Member

DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION

Dr. Donald G. Phelps, Chancellor

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY POLICY

The Los Angeles Community College District is committed to the philosophy of equal opportunity/equal access in all its employment, educational programs and services. Thus, we are firmly committed to a policy of non-discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, ancestry, religion, creed, sex, age, handicap, marital status, sexual orientation, or veteran status in our employment or educational programs and activities. In order to ensure the proper handling of all civil rights matters, each college in the District has its own Affirmative Action Representative; Title IX/Sex-Equity Coordinator, Section 504, Coordinator of Handicap Programs; and an Ombudsperson. Direct initial inquiries to the District Office of Affirmative Action Programs and Services, (213) 891-2315.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
OVERVIEW	1
DESCRIPTION OF PACE	3
Pace Goals	3
Implementation in the District	4
DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS	5
Evaluation Model	5
Evaluation Committee	5
Focus of Evaluation	5
EVALUATION RESULTS	7
Description of Students	7
Program Quality Indicators	10
Nature of Courses	10
Course Rigor	11
Student Outcomes	13
Retention	13
Retention by Ethnicity and Age	16
A.A. Degree Completion	20
Transfer GPAs.	21
Faculty and Student Views of the Program.	23
Student Opinion	23
Comparison to Traditional Courses.	24
Faculty Opinion	24
FUTURE EVALUATION NEEDS	28
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	29
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS	31
REFERENCES	33
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	34
APPENDIX	35

TABLES INDEX

		Page
Table 1	PACE Student Characteristics	7
Table 2	PACE Course Syllabi Analysis	12
Table 3	Semester to Semester Retention	15
Table 4	Semester to Semester Retention by Ethnicity .	17
Table 5	Semester to Semester Retention by Age . . .	19
Table 6	A.A. Degree Completion	21
Table 7	PACE Students' Transfer GPA	22
Table 8	Factors Influencing Student Enrollment. . .	23
Table 9	PACE Compared to Traditional Courses . . .	24
Table 10	Faculty Reasons for Choosing PACE Assignment.	25
Table 11	PACE Faculty Overall Rating of PACE . .	25
Table 12	Faculty Recommendations for Improvement in Conferences	26
Table 13	Faculty Recommendations for Improvement in Program	27

OVERVIEW

The purpose of this evaluation is threefold. First and foremost is to increase knowledge and understanding of the PACE program. The program is relatively new, it is different, and it is growing. Each of these characteristics in itself would cause curiosity, all of them centered in one program demands examination. It is hoped that a better understanding of what the program is will serve to eliminate uninformed impressions.

Secondly, the evaluation examines available data in order to access the effectiveness of the program. On the one hand, there has been an abundance of testimonials and anecdoctal information on student and program successes. On the other hand, there has been suspicion expressed by those outside the program. These have limited value in the academic community. Inquisitive and skeptical educators must look to empirical evidence. This evaluation offers all that is available under time and resource limitations. What is offered gives substantial evidence.

Finally, the evaluation attempts to provide information and recommendations which can be used for program improvement. PACE is not without its own struggles and areas of weakness. It is a program, however, that is willing to identify and address these.

What, then, are the conclusions of the evaluation? Just as PACE is non-traditional, it attracts non-traditional students. PACE students are older, more often female and more often Black. For the most part they are full-time workers and almost exclusively interested in transfer. Faculty find them to be more mature, more committed to educational goals, better class participants and better at completing class assignments.

In examining the nature of PACE courses, it is noted that all courses offered are subject to the same standards as regular courses and in fact exceed the hour/unit equivalency required for regular courses.

A course rigor analysis revealed that PACE classes require a significant number of student assignments, including substantial writing. These are in addition to regular reading assignments. It is also clear from course syllabi that class attendance is essential.

Both within semester and between semester retention was examined. This revealed a less than desired within semester retention rate. The semester to semester, long term retention, however, far exceeds that of regular students. Also, in examining retention by ethnicity and age it is noted that Black students in PACE have a much greater retention rate than their counterparts in the regular program. Students under 20 in PACE drop out more quickly than those in the regular program.

A.A. degree comparisons show a much higher completion in PACE than the regular program but falls somewhat below PACE program goals.

Transfer grade point average (gpa) data was available from Pepperdine University's School of Business and Management and revealed that the average PACE transfer student has a gpa of .23 higher than the overall gpa for other Business School students.

Major factors which have influenced students to enroll in PACE are the program schedule and convenient locations. A significant percentage (39.8%) rate PACE classes as better than regular classes they have taken.

PACE faculty are attracted to the program largely because of the opportunity to team teach in an interdisciplinary and theme approach and to teach motivated students. Faculty overall rating of PACE is largely good (71.4%) with many rating it excellent (20.4%). A small portion (8.2%) view it as poor.

Faculty gave many recommendations for program improvement including the need for better budget and resources, improvement of television segments, better orientation for both students and faculty, and the desire for more classroom time.

Specific findings and recommendations are included in the report and in summary on pages 29 to 31.

The evaluation demonstrates that PACE is tapping a different student clientele and serving these students effectively. The areas where improvement is needed are noted in the report and should provide the basis for further discussion and planning. Recommendations for future evaluation are also included.

DESCRIPTION OF PACE

The Project for Adult College Education (PACE) is a unique educational delivery system designed especially to meet the needs of adult learners. It originated in 1973 at Wayne State University, the work of a man named Otto Feinstein. The basic philosophy of the program centers around the needs and attributes of the student. Feinstein targeted the working adult as a population neglected by higher education and set out to not only tap this new source of student but to make a structural change in higher education which would mold the education around the student, not the student around the education (Feinstein & Angelo,1977).

The basic elements of the PACE program are: television courses, conferences and seminars, off-campus locations, theme focused inter-disciplinary courses, and team teaching. The curriculum is humanities based.

This educational approach was labeled PACE in the mid-1970's when the American Federation of Teachers (AFL-CIO) adopted it as the official logo for the union affiliated program. It was through the efforts of a Los Angeles SEIU local that PACE came to the Los Angeles Community Colleges in 1981.

Initially, the intended goals of PACE were not explicitly articulated but the program was initiated to be responsive to community needs, to work cooperatively with local unions and industry, to increase District enrollment and to tap new enrollment sources. As the program has grown and matured, the following goals have been adopted by the PACE Evaluation Steering Committee:

Pace Goals

1. To provide a quality, liberal arts/humanities-based education to full-time working adults accomplished through interdisciplinary and team-taught classes, a curriculum based on themes oriented to working adults, and use of a delivery system consisting of television components, weekend conferences, and class lectures.

2. To make a full-time education available to students unable to conform to the traditional education process, thereby condensing the amount of time required to complete the program.

3. To prepare students for transfer to 4-year colleges by offering a fully transferable curriculum.

4. To qualify students for the A.A. degree.

5. To assist students in developing reading, writing, and critical thinking skills.

These goals are consistent with the District's mission and not dissimilar to goals of the regular instructional program. The major difference is the delivery system and the specificity of the curriculum.

Implementation in the District

A PACE pilot program was instituted at Harbor College in the Fall 1981 with an enrollment of 76 students. In Fall 1985 Mission College opened its first PACE sections. Currently, PACE programs are operating at all District colleges except City and Valley. Trade-Technical was the last to implement PACE in FAll 1988. Fall 1988 PACE enrollment Districtwide is estimated at 3000. Growth of the program is constrained in the District only by reservation of resources to support growth.

DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS

Evaluation Model

This evaluation was conducted based on the Model for Assessing Quality of Non-traditional Programs in Higher Education, developed at Saint Louis University-Missouri (Harshman, 1979). The evaluation is formative in nature based on several assumptions. First, the major goal of the evaluation is to use both positive and negative results to plan for improvement of the program. Second, the evaluation should include both subjective and objective data in order to avoid restriction of the definition and measurement of quality. Third, evaluation should be an on-going activity. Fourth, although the program should not be solely responsible for judgment of quality, it should have some control over the definition and assessment of its own qualify.

In the evaluation outcomes, there will be those who note a minimum of direct comparison between the PACE program and the regular instructional program. There are several reasons for this. First, the evaluation is essentially a criterion referenced evaluation. The standards used for quality assessment are those set by the program through the evaluation process. In setting these standards (or criterion), reference may or may not be made to the regular program. Secondly, since there is a glaring lack of evaluation outcomes for the regular instructional program, direct comparison would have been impossible in many cases.

Evaluation Committee

In Spring 1988, a PACE Evaluation Steering Committee was formed to plan and oversee the evaluation. The committee was coordinated by the Office of Student Services in the Educational Research and Development Division (see page 34 for list of members). In order to provide balance, the committee composition, consistent with the evaluation model, consists of representative from PACE program personnel as well as representatives from outside the program.

Focus of the Evaluation

In its short life with the District, the PACE program has been discussed, reviewed, surveyed, and examined from a variety of perspectives. There is an array of questions which have been asked and there are a number of questions which remain. As with any evaluation, the number of questions which can be addressed at one time are limited. One of the first tasks of the PACE Evaluation Steering Committee was to determine what the focus of the evaluation should be. The results of the evaluation will not address the concerns of everyone but hopefully will increase understanding of the program. Areas for further evaluation are noted. This initial exploration has identified a focus on four areas:

a. description of students
b. program quality indicators
c. student outcomes
d. faculty and student views of the program

The committee encountered certain obstacles and limitations even within these areas, including lack of data and data sources. These will also need to improve to facilitate effective future evaluations.

Several sources of information were tapped. First, the Spring 1987 PACE Survey conducted by the Office of Educational Planning and Research was used. Student retention data came from enrollment records. Some data were retreived through computer reports generated by the Office of Education Planning and Research and other data were calculated manually. Transfer data was contributed by Pepperdine University.

EVALUATION RESULTS

Description of Students

The question to be addressed here is "who are the PACE students?" To meet program goals, the PACE students should look different in some ways than regular students. We turn to the student survey results to address this question.

Selected characteristics for District PACE students are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

PACE Student Characteristics

AGE	PACE %	REGULAR %
17 - 19	2.6	19.7
20 - 24	14.6	28.6
25 - 34	37.7	28.9
35+	45.2	22.7
	N= 1398	*

SEX	PACE %	REGULAR %
Male	23.2	44.9
Female	76.8	55.9
	N = 1428	*

ETHNICITY	PACE %	REGULAR %
Asian	3.1	14.5
Black	27.4	18.4
Latino	19.0	25.9
White	45.9	37.8
Other	4.6	0.4
	N = 1416	*

PLAN TO TRANSFER	PACE %	REGULAR %
Yes	91.0	54.7
No	9.0	45.3
	N = 1427	*

AFFILIATED WITH A UNION	PACE %
Yes	27.2
No	72.8
	N = 1457

HOURS WORKED PER WEEK	PACE %
Full-time (31+ hrs)	87.8
Part-time (1-30 hrs)	8.9
None	3.3
	N = 1476

ENROLL IN COLLEGE IF NO PACE	%
Yes	63.8
No	36.2
	N = 1466

Note: PACE data source is the Spring 1987 PACE Survey.
*Regular N = 102,209, data source is Student Data Tape 551.

In the categories of age, sex, and ethnicity, the PACE students differ from the regular student population by being older, more often females, more often Black and less often Asian. This suggests a number of conclusions regarding PACE students. First, PACE is attractive to a greater extent than the regular program to non-traditional students: older, female, and Black. While Pace has no explicit goals regarding these particular students, it is important to recognize that PACE appears to serve a significant clientele that cannot be reached to the same extent by the regular program.

FINDING: PACE serves a non-traditional student clientele: older, more females, and more Blacks.

RECOMMENDATION: Follow-up should be conducted to determine if these non-traditional students are achieving success in PACE consistent with PACE goals.

The survey results indicate that 91% of the students in the PACE program have a goal to transfer to a four-year college. This result exceeds the standard range of 77-89% which was set for the evaluation. Since PACE is designed as a transfer program, a high response could be expected. The question of greater concern, however, is how many students do actually transfer.

FINDING: Ninety-one percent of PACE students have a transfer goal.

Union association has historically been what makes a PACE program a PACE program, as opposed to just a non-traditional delivery system. The survey results indicate that 27% of PACE students are affiliated with a union. This falls within the accepted standard range of 27-37%. It is notable that 41% of the survey respondents are either in managerial or professional positions which would reduce the tendency of union affiliation.

FINDING: Twenty-seven percent of PACE students are affiliated with a union.

RECOMMENDATION: PACE should consider whether a stronger link with union affiliation is desired and if so, determine ways to strengthen it.

A majority of PACE students may not be union affiliated but they are resoundingly full-time workers. PACE considers 31 or more hours per week to be full-time and set a goal of enrolling 87-95% of PACE students in this category, indicating a strong commitment to the full-time working adult. The survey revealed that 88% of PACE students were full-time workers. Only 3% indicated they did not work at all.

FINDING: Eighty-eight percent of PACE students are full-time workers. These results are significant considering the fact that PACE recognized from its inception at Wayne State that working adults constituted a segment which was neglected by higher

education. PACE is reaching this segment in a way not possible by traditional education.

There was a question included on the survey to address the concern that PACE is just taking students from the regular program. The question is, "Would you have enrolled in college if there were no PACE program?" The response is reflected in Table 1. In examining the question, the committee felt that it did not ask enough. The fact that a student may have enrolled without PACE does not tell how many courses he would have taken. Their "yes" response on the question could really mean that they would have enrolled in one or two courses instead of 12 units of PACE.

RECOMMENDATION: A more meaningful question should be developed for a future survey to ascertain to what extent PACE students would have enrolled in the regular program without PACE.

There was a wide range of opinion on what the standard should be on the question of enrollment without PACE. The standard range of 53-73% is indicative of this. With a survey result of only 36% who said they would not be enrolled in college if they were not enrolled in PACE, it may be concluded that PACE needs to do better in reaching students who would not attend the regular program. On the other hand, many argue that a program that brings approximately 1000 (36% of Fall 1988 PACE enrollment), full-time students to the District should be encouraged to keep up the good work.

RECOMMENDATION: PACE should strengthen recruitment efforts to non-traditional clientele.

Input from the PACE faculty survey gives another glimpse of PACE student characteristics. In comparing PACE students with regular students, 82% of the faculty surveyed rate PACE students as more interested in learning; 86% rate them as more mature; 72% rate them as more committed to education goals; 63% rate them as engaging in more class participation (8% rated them less); 53% rated them as better at completion of assignments. Forty-seven percent of faculty rated PACE students as having "more" "capacity to understand curriculum", although 16% rated PACE students "less" in this category.

FINDING: Many faculty find PACE students to be more mature, committed to learning, and more involved in class participation and assignments.

PROGRAM QUALITY INDICATORS

Program quality has been the focus of many questions regarding PACE. It is not new that non-traditional programs are subject to greater scrutiny than other programs. For faculty particularly, the underlying question is "are the courses in PACE equal to those in the regular program?" Factors which make this analysis difficult, if not impossible, are 1) regular program courses differ significantly in their nature and delivery from PACE so that a direct comparison is essentially a comparison of "apples to oranges; 2) there is no evidence that "regular" courses are comparable themselves in any way, other than course outlines and number of hours scheduled, and 3) regular courses are not examined to have any pedagogical basis for comparison. Since the intrinsic comparison of traditional versus non-traditional courses is not possible because of these factors, outcome measures are more heavily relied upon. These are dealt with in the student outcomes section of this evaluation. This section will explore the courses themselves.

Nature of the Courses

Courses in the PACE program are put together as a liberal studies, humanities based, transfer curriculum. The program is designed so that students may complete requirements for an A.A. degree and transfer to a four-year college in five semesters.

PACE course equivalency can be validated in several ways. First, courses offered through the program are standard courses which have been approved as part of the college curriculum. Second, PACE faculty structure courses to meet the college approved course outlines. Third, the number of hours of instruction required for PACE slightly exceeds the number for a 12 unit equivalency.

The hour/unit conversion, assuming a 20 week semester, computes as follows:

PACE Course Hours Equivalency

Instructional Mode	Hours	Units Earned
Lecture	4 hours per week	4 units
Conference	64 hours per semester	3 units
Television	2 hours per week*	6 units
	TOTAL	= 13 units
Laboratory	2 hours per week**	1 unit
	TOTAL	= 14 units

*one hour per week of television broadcasting meets requirement for a 3 unit class.
**required only in conjunction with lab sciences

This analysis demonstrates that in semesters which include the laboratory requirement, students' hours exceed the hours requirement by a 2 unit equivalency. In semesters which do not include the laboratory requirement, hours are exceeded by only a 1 unit equivalency.

FINDING: PACE courses exceed hours required for 12 units.

Course Rigor

To examine course rigor, the Evaluation Steering Committee recommended a review of course syllabi from regular and PACE courses. This proved to be infeasible. Nineteen course syllabi for PACE were collected but efforts to collect syllabi or outlines for regular courses were not successful. The 19 PACE syllabi represent 9 out of 13 (69%) course offerings for Fall 1988.

As an alternative to the comparison of course syllabi for PACE and regular courses, an analysis of the PACE syllabi was undertaken to attempt to get a sense of the rigor of these courses. Student assignments were reviewed for each of the 17 syllabi noting numbers of the following: quizzes, examinations, term papers, research papers/projects, and essays. Syllabi were examined for the following courses: History 12, Sociology 1, Political Science 1, Humanities 61, Music 111, Psychology 1 and Speech 5. English was excluded because these traditionally have a high volume of written assignments. Table 2 gives the results of this analysis.

Table 2

PACE Course Syllabi Analysis

Course	Semester Assignments					
	Quiz	Exam	Term Paper	Project	Essays	Total Assignment
History	5	2	2			9
History		2	1			3
Sociology	2	2		1		5
Sociology		2	1			3
Pol. Sci.	4	2	1			7
Pol. Sci.		2	1			3
Pol. Sci.		2				2
Pol. Sci.		2			1	3
Humanities	6	2			2	10
Humanities		2	1			3
Humanities		2	1			3
Music	3	1	1			5
Music		3		9		12
Music	2	1	1			4
Psychology		3		1		4
Psychology		2			1	3
Speech	3	2				5
					Total =	84
					Average assignments per class =	4.9

All seventeen classes had reading assignments and examinations. An average of 4.9 assignments (in addition to reading) were made for each class. This included an average of 2 examinations for each class and all but one of the seventeen included additional writing assignments. Thirteen of the seventeen required a written term paper or project.

FINDING: An average of 4.9 written and/or performance assignments were required in all PACE classes, in addition to regular reading assignments.

It is hoped that from this brief analysis, individual comparisons can be made. However, since pedagogical practice and philosophy differ so greatly among faculty, it is expected that conclusions regarding the rigor of these courses will vary widely. Perhaps this can serve to promote further review and discussion on academic rigor and quality in general.

RECOMMENDATION: Faculty should develop course evaluation criteria which can be applied to both regular and non-traditional courses alike to provide input to enhance academic quality.

STUDENT OUTCOMES

Student outcomes are probably the most important element in determining student success which reflects on the effectiveness of the PACE program. Three student outcome measures for which data were collected are retention, program completion (A.A. degree), and transfer grade point average. Lack of student outcome data has been a major deterrent to outcome evaluation of any kind. There has been recent progress in this area and more is expected as matriculation evaluation efforts demand a greater emphasis in this area. The outcome data provided in this report combines computer generated data with manually compiled data from the District's student data base. Transfer grade point average information was obtained from Pepperdine University, School of Business and Management. The data available are not comprehensive and in some cases do not allow exact equivalent comparisons. Also, retention studies were not able to distinguish continued enrollment in PACE as opposed to any program. The study assumes that continued enrollment is consistent in either PACE or regular courses. The comparisons that are made, however, give the reader a framework to ascertain the basis on which conclusions have been reached.

Transfer data must ultimately be a part of measuring the success of all programs, however, to this point a process for collecting that kind of data has not been developed. Again, this must be developed as a part of the matriculation program and can then be applied to PACE students as well.

An upper division PACE program is offered at three of the California State Universities: Dominguez Hills, Los Angeles, and Northridge. However, PACE program staff are aware that many students transfer into regular upper division programs at a variety of public and private institutions such as U.C.L.A., U.S.C., Pepperdine University, Redlands, and C.S.U. Long Beach. This makes student tracking very difficult. At transfer institutions familiar with PACE, anecdoctal information abounds regarding the high quality of PACE transfer students. Additional empirical evidence, however, must be collected to support the perception.

Retention

Harbor College and Mission College, the two longest running PACE programs in the District, provide the case studies for retention data. Harbor College began the regular PACE program in Fall 1983 after an earlier pilot program. The Fall 1984 PACE enrollment will be examined for retention outcomes. This semester was selected because PACE students had been identified for that semester at Harbor and data was most readily available for both

PACE and regular students. The Office of Educational Planning and Research produced computer reports for the Fall 1984 student groups.

Mission College began its first PACE class in Fall 1985 and that group will also be examined for retention data. PACE program retention was completed through a manual process whereby the record of each student enrolled in PACE was checked and manually tallied. This task was completed by the Office of Student Services, Attendance Accounting.

Within Semester Retention

The within semester retention goal for the PACE program was set at 71-77%. Fall 1985 enrollment at Mission was used to address this question. This was determined by comparing student names on permanent class rosters to student grade records. Seventy-four percent of the students enrolled by fourth week received grades at the end of the semester, therefore the student enrollment records reflect a within semester retention rate for Mission PACE at 74%, well within the acceptable range.

This PACE retention rate is less than the regular Fall 1985 "1st census to end of semester" rate for both Mission (82%) and Districtwide (76.9%) as reported on the WSCH Measurements of Enrollment Report (D4790). A lower rate for PACE can be expected because it is a full-time transfer program for which many students are not prepared.

FINDING: Within semester retention of 74% meets program retention goals.

Semester to Semester Retention

Table 3 shows semester to semester retention by following the Fall 1984 entering-student cohort (except for Mission which reflects the Fall 1985 cohort for PACE) through five semesters of enrollment. The retention goal set for the PACE evaluation for first year retention (meaning a student returns for the second semester) ranged from 66-72%. This goal is an aggressive one considering the normal retention pattern for community college students which ranges from 44.4% to 62.4% Districtwide for the Fall 1984 cohort. In any case, Table 3 shows that the retention goal was exceeded in both the case of Harbor and Mission. This data supports the perception many have had, that PACE retains students.

The PACE semester retention records look even more positive when compared to retention data for non-PACE students. At Harbor, second semester retention for PACE exceeds the regular program by 14.5%, a significant difference. By the fifth semester, the PACE retention lead increased to 17.6% over the regular program.

Table 3

Semester to Semester Retention: PACE Compared to Regular Students

	Harbor			Mission		
	% of Original Cohort			% of Original Cohort		
	Pace*	Regular	PACE Difference	Pace+	Regular	PACE Difference
Present 2nd Semester	74.3	59.8	+14.5	82.1	44.4	+37.7
Present 3rd Semester	55.7	40.2	+15.5	71.5	25	+46.5
Present 4th Semester	51.4	29.3	+22.1	57.8	19.2	+38.6
Present 5th Semester	37.1	19.5	+17.6	48.9	11.3	+37.6

*First-Time Entering Students, Fall 1984
+All beginning PACE Students, Fall 1985

The retention difference at Mission is even greater. Mission's regular student retention rate is among the lowest in the District. The PACE retention, however, exceeds even that of Harbor PACE with a rate of 37.7% greater than the regular program for second semester retention and 37.6% by the fifth semester.

FINDING: PACE semester to semester retention exceeds goals and retention in regular classes.

Retention by Ethnicity and Age

Comparable ethnicity and age data for PACE and regular students was only available for the Harbor group. Table 4 shows the retention data by ethnic differences. Since only first-time entering students are included, the Harbor PACE population is small at 70. Even so, in comparing it with Districtwide data, some very enticing conclusions are evident. The small number of Asian and Hispanic PACE students would prohibit any conclusions regarding these categories.

White PACE students, however, show significantly higher retention than white regular students, with 75% retention the second semester versus 61.9%. By the fifth semester, the PACE retention rate for Whites is 23.7% higher than regular Whites.

Black PACE students have an even greater retention rate over Blacks in the regular program. This is a very significant finding in light of concern for minority enrollment and retention in higher education. First, it is noted that first-time entering Black student enrollment for Fall 1984 was 20.9% of all first-time entering students. Fall 1984 Black enrollment at Harbor was 14% of their total enrollment. PACE program enrollment, however, shows Blacks making up 40% of the total first-time entering PACE students for Fall 1984. This shows a strong attraction to the PACE program for Black students.

Table 4 shows that second semester retention for first-time entering Blacks Districtwide was only 50%, while the same figure for PACE Blacks was 78.6%, a 28.6% greater retention rate. This margin is held above 20% for the third and fourth semester retention and by the fifth semester holds at 16.3% greater retention.

In the Spring 1987 survey, student reported ethnicity shows 27.4% of PACE enrollment was Black compared to 18.4% of regular enrollment for Fall 1987. Again, the PACE program appears to be attracting a better proportion of Black students. Since good PACE data are not available across time, it is not possible to look at trends in this regard.

Table 4

Semester to Semester Retention by Ethnicity: First-Time Entering Students, Fall 1984
PACE Compared to Regular Students

	Asian		Black		Hispanic		White		Other	
	Pace*	Regular+	Pace*	Regular+	Pace*	Regular+	Pace*	Regular+	Pace*	Regular+
	N=3	N=2173	N=28	N=3719	N=9	N=5030	N=28	N=6174	N=2	N=651
Still Present	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%		
2nd Semester	100.0	69.6	78.6	50.0	44.4	61.3	75.0	61.9	100.0	62.4
Still Present 3rd Present	66.7	51.7	50.0	29.1	44.4	42.3	64.3	42.8	50.0	44.1
Still Present 4th Semester	66.7	40.7	42.9	20.4	44.4	32.3	60.7	33	50.0	33.6
Still Present 5th Semester	33.3	30.0	28.6	12.3	33.3	22.2	46.4	22.7	50.0	23.5

*Harbor only
+All colleges

It is significant that PACE is not only attracting minority students but that minority students, as well as White students, in PACE have greater retention rates than students in the regular program. The significance of this fact increases considering that PACE is a transfer program and students are enrolled in transfer level courses.

FINDING: PACE attracts and retains Black students better than the regular program.

Table 5 shows retention among age groups. The same cautions offered regarding the ethnicity data are appplicable here. That is that the PACE group for Harbor is small and comparison is made against Districtwide data. Even so, the data raises the suggestion tha not only is PACE more attractive to older students than younger students, the nature of the program which addresses itself to experienced working adults, does not do well in retaining younger students but does much better than the regular program in retaining students 25 years and older.

FINDING: PACE shows greater retention for older students.

The experience of those familiar with PACE sheds some light on reasons for these phenomena. As mature working adults, PACE students are more realistic about setting goals and sticking with them. In addition, the program attempts to make the courses and requirements relevant to adults and their environment. This tends to increase their interest. Other research has shown that minorities more often have home situations which prevent them from participating in a traditional educational program. The PACE schedule gives students the opportunity to juggle responsibilties of work and home and college. Another factor, which it is felt contributes to success is the strong sense of community which is developed among students who move through the curriculum as a group. Students form study and support groups and work together semester after semester. The importance of this phenomena is suggested by Astin (1985) in his work on college success.

Despite these positive results, there is hope that student retention would increase if additional consideration were given to help with English and math skills.

One problem identified is that all students do not take English in their first year. In fact, because the PACE curriculum is circular, a student could potentially not enroll in English until their last semester in the program. This is not desirable considering the fact that success in PACE transfer courses depends heavily on a student's ability to read and write well. Students who place at the English 28 level in entry assessment are at an even greater disadvantage because this necessitates additional course work.

Table 5

Semester to Semester Retention by Age: Pace Compared to Regular Students
First-Time Entering Students, Fall 1984

	Under 20		20-24		25-34		35 Plus	
	Pace* N=4	Regular+ N=9463	Pace* N=12	Regular+ N=3558	Pace* N=30	Regular+ N=3208	Pace* N=25	Regular+ N=2076
Still Present 2nd Semester	% 50.0	% 70.4	% 66.7	% 50.8	% 66.7	% 47.6	% 88.0	% 48.9
Still Present 3rd Present	0.0	51.2	41.7	32.0	56.7	28.1	68.0	29.5
Still Present 4th Semester	0.0	40.9	41.7	23.1	56.7	18.5	56.0	20.1
Still Present 5th Semester	0.0	28.5	25.0	15.1	40.0	12.1	44.0	12.7

*Harbor College
+All colleges

The recent increase in math level required for transfer to the California State University system brings another concern to PACE for students who need lower level math instruction. These additional courses are not offered as part of the PACE format and can prolong completion of the program.

RECOMMENDATION: To increase retention, offer transfer English and math courses every semester. Consideration should be given to structuring the curriculum so that a student's first semester always consists of English and math, plus two courses. These latter two courses could rotate, as would courses offered in the subsequent semesters, creating multiple tiers or tracks for students. For students who test below the transfer level English and math, a pre-PACE or PACE prerequisite tier could be added to prepare students for transfer level courses.

It is also recommended that all five PACE tiers be offered somewhere in the District at all times so that students who miss a semester or have met partial requirements could enroll without having to wait for the appropriate course sequence.

It is recognized that these recommendations represent considerable additional cost for additional teachers and television broadcasting. These costs need to be further examined in view of potential enrollment and retention success.

A.A. Degree Completion

Encouraging students to complete the A.A. degree before transfer has been stated as a goal of the PACE program. Since A.A. completion is not neccessary to transfer, and most PACE students are transfer students, fewer students are expected to complete the degree. Nevertheless, the program has set a goal of degree completion at 40-50% in five semesters or less and 59-71% in six to nine semesters. Again, these are very high goals considering the low number of regular transfer students who complete the A.A. degree.

Harbor, Fall 1984 students, and Mission, Fall 1985 students, serve as samples for degree completion also. In both cases student enrollment records for these two semesters were manually accessed to determine if an A.A. degree was granted. Table 6 reports results.

Table 6

PACE Students
A.A. Degree Completion

	Harbor		Mission	
	≤5 Semesters	6 Semesters	≤5 Semesters	6 Semesters
AA Degree	31.9%	35.6%	28%	28.9%
	N*=241		N+=190	

*Fall 1984 cohort
+Fall 1985 cohort

Table 6 indicates that PACE fell below its goal for students completing the A.A. degree. For graduates in five semesters or less, Harbor was 8% below the goal and Mission 12% below the minimum goal of 40%. Harbor fell 22.5% below the 6-9 semester minimum goal of 59% and Mission fell 30% below that goal.

To give some overall perspective to the completion rate for PACE, there may be some value in reviewing A.A. degree completion rates for regular program students. The 1987-88 graduates reported on the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) report for Harbor College was 477. This calculates to a 5.5% degree completion rate based on Fall 1987 enrollment. For Mission, the IPEDS reports 173 graduates for 1987-88, 3.3% of Fall 1987 enrollment. In both cases, PACE students are included which tends to boost the graduation rates considerably.

FINDING: PACE has not met its goal for students completing the AA degree, however, when compared to the regular program, PACE graduates exceed regular graduates by over 20% at colleges sampled.

RECOMMENDATION: The PACE program should identify obstacles to AA degree completion and explore ways to increase it.

Transfer GPAs

The grade point average of students who transfer to 4-year colleges provides an important student outcome indicator. Table 7, while reflecting a small number of PACE transfer students, does give some indication of transfer success. This information indicates grade point averages (GPA) for PACE transfer students

and the overall grade point averages for all transfer students entering the School of Business and Management at Pepperdine University in Fall 1988.

Table 7

PACE Student's Transfer GPA

PACE College	N	Transfer GPA
East	1	3.35
Harbor	7	3.20
Pierce	17	3.37
Southwest	2	2.68
West	6	2.81
Total PACE Students	33	3.19
Total Business School	131	2.96

The 3.19 grade point average for PACE transfer students exceeds the 2.96 grade point average for all entering transfer students in the School of Business and Management at Pepperdine University. Eighty-one percent of these PACE transfer students exceeded the overall grade point average for the Fall 1988 class. This data presents a solid indication of PACE student success. Grade inflation cannot be speculated here because all these students were competing on an equal basis at this transfer institution.

FINDING: The transfer grade point average for PACE students exceeds that of other students in Pepperdine University's School of Business and Management.

FACULTY AND STUDENT VIEWS OF THE PROGRAM

Student Opinion

It is important to understand what has attracted students to enroll in the PACE program. The Spring 1987 survey reveals that the most important attraction is the schedule of the program.

Table 8

Factors Influencing Students' Decision to Enroll

	Much	Some	Little	None
Program schedule	85.8	11.0	1.8	1.4
Convenient location	68.0	22.1	6.3	3.6
Friends	10.3	12.5	14.7	62.5
Course content	29.2	42.3	19.2	9.4
Television component	6.8	16.2	24.8	52.2

N varies from 1459 to 1473

Note. From Spring 1987 PACE Survey.

The PACE schedule had "some" or "much" influence on 96.8% of the survey respondents. Clearly, schedule is a major factor in attracting students to PACE.

Convenient location was the next highest attractor with 90% of the respondents indicating "some" or "much" influence. Friends had little influence on student enrollment although the survey also revealed that 24% of the survey respondents had first learned about PACE from their friends (PE-12).

Course content was a moderate attractor for students with 77.5% responding "some" or "much."

The television component item is probably misleading because it could actually be considered a part of the scheduling of the program. The survey indicates that as an influence to enroll, it had very little impact. However, this could be a spill-over of students' view of the television component which is revealed in the survey (PE-65) and indicates that 29% would give the PACE television materials a "D" or "F" grade. Thirty-four percent graded it a "C", 26% a "B" and only 11% graded it "A".

FINDING: PACE program schedule and locations are major attractors for students.

Comparison to Traditional Courses

Students who had taken traditional courses prior to PACE were asked in the Spring 1987 survey (PE-43) to compare traditional courses to PACE. Results are shown in Table 9.

Table 9

Students Comparing PACE to Traditional Courses

Better	39.8%
Same	52.9%
Worse	7.4%
	N = 1225

Note. From Spring 1987 PACE Survey

Nearly 40% of the respondents rated PACE as better than traditional courses they had taken. While this is a favorable rating, the question is not specific enough to indicate what is being rated. Is it the course content, teaching methodology, scheduling, or what? The 7% "worse" rating is not overwhelming but sufficiently large that some concern is generated. Unfortunately, because of the vagueness of the question, not much information is provided.

Students were asked to grade the quality of instruction (PE-70). The PACE goals were exceeded in this rating. PACE instruction was rated "A" by 53.8% of the respondents. This by far exceeded the PACE goal of 20% - 30% for this rating. Thirty-seven and one-half percent (37.5%) rated the quality of instruction as "B" and 7.6% gave a "C" rating. Grades of "D" and "F" were negligible at 1.1% (N=1460). These ratings indicate that students view the quality of instruction in the PACE program quite favorably.

FINDING: The majority of PACE students view the quality of instruction as excellent ("A").

Faculty Opinion

The faculty teaching in PACE hold a combination of regular and limited assignments. Forty-nine out of 57 PACE faculty responded to the Spring 1987 survey. At that time 49% were full-time tenured faculty and 43% were full-time temporary, with 8% assigned as part-time temporary.

Table 10 reflects reasons faculty gave in the Spring 1987 survey for accepting a PACE teaching assignment. The nature of the PACE program, including its interdisciplinary approach, and opportunity to team teach was the major attractor for faculty. Twenty-one percent of the reponses indicated that they were interested in full-time employment. Since new teaching opportunities have been limited for several years, PACE offered an opportunity for employment for a number of new faculty. In addition, some regular faculty (6%) had been assigned to PACE due to budget limitations in regular classes. Another major factor for faculty teaching PACE, according to the survey, is the desire to teach motivated adults.

Table 10

Faculty Reasons for Choosing PACE Assignments

1.	Nature of Program (i.e. interdisciplinary, team taught, theme approach)	34%
2.	To teach full-time	21%
3.	To teach motivated adults	17%
4.	Challenge of assignment	9%
5.	Needed a change	7%
6.	Enthusiasm of other PACE faculty	6%
7.	Reassigned by administration	6%
8.	Miscellaneous	6%

N = 53*

*Some respondents made multiple comments.

Note. From Spring 1987 PACE Survey

While PACE faculty offered many suggestions for program improvement (see Tables 12 and 13), their overall rating of the PACE program is very favorable, reflected in Table 11.

Table 11

PACE Faculty Overall Rating of PACE

Excellent	20.4%
Good	71.4%
Poor	8.2%

N = 49

Note. From Spring 1987 PACE Survey

The PACE evaluation goal for faculty rating the program was to have 55-69% rate it as good, with 22-28% rating it as excellent. Comparing these standards to the survey results shows a lightly less than desired "excellent" rating (-2%) and a slightly higher "good" rating. The combined results show 92% of PACE faculty rate the program as "good" or "excellent". Eight percent gave a "poor" rating. While the survey results fell within the acceptable evaluation standards, the "poor" rating of 8% is not desirable.

FINDING: 92% of PACE faculty give the program good or excellent ratings.

RECOMMENDATION: Further surveys should attempt to identify the cause for the "poor" rating of a small number of faculty so that constructive input can be provided to the program.

Table 12 identifies faculty suggestions for improvement of Saturday conferences. Three of the highest rated recommendation are related to budget and other resources, addressing the operational elements of the conference. Comments related to pedagogical issues suggest that some faculty would prefer more classroom time with the students and that the conference activities should more closely relate to classroom discussions and activities.

Table 12

Faculty Recommendations for Improvement in Conferences

1.	Better budget needed	20%
2.	More time needed for lectures, exams, and individual student attention	14%
3.	Better facilities and equipment needed	14%
4.	More support staff needed	10%
5.	Share ideas and speakers among programs	8%
6.	Improve focus on relating to classroom activities and discussions	8%
7.	Shorter hours, increase number of sessions	6%
8.	Have smaller classes	5%
9.	Miscellaneous single comments	15%

N = 79*

*Some respondents made multiple comments.

Note. From Spring 1987 PACE Survey

RECOMMENDATION: Specific budget, facilities and equipment needs should be identified. Faculty should be consulted more closely in conference planning to assure alignment with classroom activities.

Table 13 identifies faculty suggestions for improvement of the overall program. It is clear that faculty and students agree that the television portion of PACE needs improvement. Another major concern is student preparation for the program. This concern, however, is not limited to PACE. PACE students receive assessment

in English and mathematics in the same manner as regular students. The difference is that underprepared PACE students are potentially placed immediately in transfer level courses. See the Retention section of this report for further discussion and recommendation.

Table 13

Faculty Recommendations for Improvement in Program

1.	Improve or eliminate TV segments	24%
2.	Screen students through prerequisites or assessment	12%
3.	Improve support services	9%
4.	Better orientation for students	4%
5.	Better orientation for faculty	4%
6.	Inform students of heavy workload required	4%
7.	Miscellaneous single responses	43%

N = 68*

*Some respondents made multiple comments.

Note. From Spring 1987 PACE Survey

RECOMMENDATION: The District must continue to strengthen its commitment to pursuing improvement of the TV segments and seek additional means to improve this area of the program.

Because of the non-traditional nature of the PACE program, faculty familiarity with the program would provide some continuity and greater opportunity for planning and improvement. This is difficult for a program which consists of 51% temporary faculty. Of faculty responding to the Spring 1987 survey, 46% had never team taught a single course or taught on an interdisciplinary basis before teaching in PACE. If these statistics are consistent across time, it demonstrates the need to stablize the PACE faculty.

RECOMMENDATION: Consideration should be given to hiring permanent PACE faculty.

FUTURE EVALUATION NEEDS

Efforts must be continued to improve data available on this program as well as others. Outcome measures are particularly important to determining program success.

Specific areas for future evaluation are:

1. Updated student characteristics
2. New student survey
3. Effectiveness of support services, especially counseling
4. Transfer follow-up
5. Faculty Assignments
6. Adequacy of budget support
7. Potential and rationale for growth

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Student Description

1. PACE serves a non-traditional student clientele with more older, more female, and more minority students.

2. Ninety-one percent of PACE students have a transfer goal.

3. Twenty-seven percent of PACE students are affiliated with a union.

4. Eighty-eight percent of PACE students are full-time workers.

5. Many faculty find PACE students to be more mature, committed to learning, and more involved in class participation and assignments.

Program Quality Indicators

6. PACE courses exceed hours required for 12 units of credit.

7. An average of 4.9 written and/or performance assignments, in addition to regular reading, were required in a sample of PACE classes.

Student Outcomes

8. PACE semester to semester retention exceeds goals and retention in regular classes.

9. Within semester retention (1st census to end) of 74% meets program retention goals.

10. PACE attracts and retains Black students better than the regular program.

11. PACE shows greater retention for older (25+) students.

12. PACE has not met its goal for students completing the AA degree however, PACE was found to exceed the regular program by 20%.

13. The transfer GPA for PACE students exceeds that of other students in Pepperdine University's School of Business and Management.

Faculty and Student Views on the Program

14. PACE program schedule and locations are major attractors for students.

15. The majority of PACE students (53.8%) view the quality of instruction as excellent ("A").

16. Ninety-two percent of PACE faculty give the PACE program a good or excellent rating.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Student Description

1. Follow-up should be conducted to determine if these non-traditional students are achieving success in PACE consistent with PACE goals.

2. PACE should consider whether a stronger link with union affiliation is desired and if so, determine ways to strengthen it.

3. PACE should strengthen recruitment efforts to non-traditional clientele.

Program Quality Indicators

4. Faculty should develop course evaluation criteria which can be applied to both regular and non-traditional courses to enhance academic quality.

Student Outcomes

5. The PACE program should identify obstacles to A.A. degree completion and explore ways to increase it.

6. To increase retention, PACE should offer transfer English and math courses every semester. Consideration should be given to structuring the curriculum so that a student's first semester always consists of English and math, plus two courses. These latter two courses could rotate, as would courses offered in the subsequent semesters, creating multiple tiers or tracks for students.

7. For students who test below the transfer level English and math, a pre-PACE or PACE pre-requisite tier could be added to prepare students for transfer level courses.

8. All five PACE tiers should be offered somewhere in the District at all times so that students who miss a semester or have met partial requirements could enroll without having to wait for the appropriate course sequence.

Faculty and Student Views of the Program

9. Further surveys should attempt to identify the cause for the "poor" rating of a small number of faculty so that constructive input can be provided to the program.

10. Specific budget, facilities and equipment needs should be identified.

11. Faculty should be consulted more closely in conference planning to assure alignment with classroom activities.

12. The District should continue and strengthen its commitment to pursuing improvement of the television segments and seek additional means to improve this area of the program.

13. Consideration should be given to hiring permanent PACE faculty.

REFERENCES

Astin, A. (1985). Achieving Educational Excellence. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Feinstein, O. & Frank, A. (1977). To Educate the People. Michigan: Wayne State University.

Harshman, C. (1979). A Model For Assessing the Quality of Non-traditional Programs in Higher Education. St. Louis, Missouri: Metropolitan College.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

PACE Evaluation Steering Committee*

Nancy Conrath	District, Educational Research
Cal Garvin	Harbor College
Kenneth Gash	CSU Dominguez Hills
Rochelle Hudson, chair	District, Student Services
Alison Jones	District, Educational Planning
Stan Levine	Mission College
Maria Luisa Mateo	Harbor College
John McDowell	Trade-Technical College
Rodney Oakes	West L.A. College
Robert Standen	Harbor College
Patricia Wilson	District Academic Senate, Trade-Technical College

Data Analysis Subcommittee

Rochelle Hudson	District, Office of Student Services
Leonard Isaksen	West L.A. College
Stan Levine	Mission College
Patricia Wilson	Trade-Technical College

Data Support

Eva Barajas	Harbor College
Jeff Creighton	Pepperdine University
Gloria Guzman	District, Student Services
George Prather	District, Educational Research

Word Processing

Dora Gonzales	Office of Student Services

*All members listed made some contribution over the nine month evaluation process, however, did not necessarily serve on the committee the entire period.

L.A.C.C.D.

PACE EVALUATION STANDARDS

Evaluation Area		Standard
1. Students completing the A.A. degree.		59 - 71%
2. Retention	1st sem	71 - 77%
	1st year	66 - 72%
	complete program	60 - 72%
3. Students with Transfer goal.		77 - 89%
4. Transferred to 4 year college.		65 - 81%
5. PACE faculty view of program.		
	rate good	55 - 69%
	rate excellent	22 - 28%
	combined	78 - 96%
6. Student perception of PACE quality compared to regular classes.		
	same	52 - 58%
	better	32 - 46%
	combined	82 - 100%
7. Students "grading" quality of PACE instruction.		
	"C"	18 - 34%
	"B"	33 - 51%
	"A"	20 - 30%
	combined	85 - 100%
8. Students who say they would not have enrolled in college if PACE were not offered.		53 - 73%
9. Students which are full-time working adults.		87 - 95%
10. Definition of full-time working adult.		30+ hours
11. Students with union affiliation.		27 - 37%

Note: Standards were developed by survey of the PACE Evaluation Committee and college PACE directors. Ranges represent .5 standard deviation from the mean of all responses for each category.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges

40

SEP 15 1989